

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

MONTE HOISINGTON,

Plaintiff,

v.

HENRY RICHARDS, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. C05-5281 RBL/KLS

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

On May 9, 2006, the court denied plaintiff's motion for a 120 day extension of the discovery and summary judgment deadlines. (Dkt. # 33). The court's order was based on plaintiff's failure to engage in discovery within the time provided in the court's scheduling order. After carefully reviewing the motion for reconsideration and the record, the court ORDERS as follows:

(1) Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. # 34) is **DENIED**. Motions for reconsideration are disfavored and will ordinarily be denied in the "absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to the court's attention earlier with reasonable diligence." Local Rule CR 7(h)(1). Here, plaintiff has identified no error in the court's order, nor presented any new facts or legal authority that suggest reconsideration is appropriate. Plaintiff complains of a delay in receiving deposition

1 subpoenas from the clerk's office for service. The Clerk's office received the subpoenas on April 4,
2 2006 and they were issued on April 14, 2006. (Dkt. # 24). The plaintiff had sufficient time to
3 schedule depositions before the discovery deadline of May 26, 2006. Plaintiff's motion is therefore
4 denied.

5 (2) The Clerk is directed to send copies of this Order to plaintiff and to the Honorable
6 Ronald B. Leighton.

7
8 DATED this 20th day of July, 2006.

9
10 

11 Karen L. Strombom
12 United States Magistrate Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27